

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(Attorney Docket № 14221US02)

In the Application of:

Mohan Kalkunte, et al.

Serial № 10/648,573

Filed: August 26, 2003

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR
HANDLING TRAFFIC FOR SERVER
SYSTEMS

Examiner: Saket K. Daftuar

Group Art Unit: 2151

Confirmation № 4096

Electronically filed on 06-JAN-2009

AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated June 25, 2007 (“Final Office Action”), in which claims 1-30 were finally rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) reverses the final rejection of claims 1-30 of the present application.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

Broadcom Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of California, and having a place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California 92617, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 014187, Frame 0145 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))

Claims 1-30 were finally rejected. Pending claims 1-30 are the subject of this appeal.

The present application includes claims 1-30, which are pending in the present application. Claims 1-30 stand rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,032,037, issued to Garnett, et al. (hereinafter, Garnett). See the

Final Office Action at page 5. The Applicant identifies claims 1-30 as the claims that are being appealed. The text of the pending claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

The Applicant has not amended any claims subsequent to the final rejection of claims 1-30 mailed on June 25, 2007.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

The invention of claim 1 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 4-5. Certain embodiments of the invention provide a method and system for processing data in a server. See the present application at page 4, lines 2-3. Aspects of the method for processing data in a server may include receiving (e.g., by the common switch blade 402 in FIG. 4; block 502 in FIG. 5) at least one packet and determining at least one function associated with the received packet (the common switch blade 402 may include suitable software and/or hardware that may be utilized to determine what functions should service a particular type or kind of received message; block 504 in FIG. 5). See *id.* at page 4, lines 3-5; page 13, ll. 25-27; page 16, line 9 – page 18, line 12. A determination (e.g., by the common switch blade 402 in FIG. 4) regarding which one of

the blade server (e.g., 403 – 405 in FIG. 4) handles the function associated with the received packet may be done (block 506 in FIG. 5). *See id.* at page 4, lines 5-6; page 16, line 9 – page 18, line 12. The received packet may be steered (e.g., by the common switch blade 402) to at least one of a plurality of blade servers (e.g., 403 – 405 in FIG. 4) that handles the determined function associated with the received packet (block 508 in FIG. 5). *See id.* at page 4, lines 6-8; page 16, line 9 – page 18, line 12.

Claims 2-10 are dependent upon claim 1.

The invention of claim 11 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5. Another embodiment of the invention may provide a machine-readable storage, having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for processing data in a server. *See id.* at page 4, lines 23-25. The at least one code section may be executable by a machine, thereby causing the machine to perform the steps as described above for processing data in a server. *See id.* at page 4, lines 25-27.

Claims 12-20 are dependent upon claim 11.

The invention of claim 21 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5. Aspects of the system for processing data in a server may include at least one of a plurality of blade servers that may receive (e.g., by the common switch blade 402 in FIG. 4; block 502 in FIG. 5) at least one packet and determine at least one function

associated with the received packet (the common switch blade 402 may include suitable software and/or hardware that may be utilized to determine what functions should service a particular type or kind of received message; block 504 in FIG. 5). *See id.* at page 5, lines 1-3; page 13, ll. 25-27; page 16, line 9 – page 18, line 12. The blade server (e.g., the common switch blade 402 in FIG. 4) may steer one or more received packets to at least one other blade server (e.g., 403 – 405 in FIG. 4) that handles the determined function. *See id.* at page 5, lines 3-5; page 16, line 9 – page 18, line 12.

Claims 22-30 are dependent upon claim 21.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,032,037, issued to Garnett, et al. (hereinafter, Garnett).

ARGUMENT
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Garnett.

I. Garnett Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-30

The Applicant turns to the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garnett. Without conceding that Garnett qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the Applicant addresses this rejection as follows. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102, MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See *id.* (internal citation omitted).

A1. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 11, and 21

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(e), the Applicant submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “determining at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet, based on said at least one received packet,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1. Regarding claim 1, the Final Office Action states the following:

Garnett discloses a method for processing data in a server, the method comprising: receiving at least one [data packet] packet (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13); **determining at least one function [load balancing]** associated with said at least one received packet (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13); and **steering [forwarding or transmitting outgoing packet] said at least one received packet to at least one of a plurality of blade servers** that handles said determined function (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13).

See the Final Office Action at pages 5-6 (emphasis added). The Applicant points out that the Examiner is using the same citations (column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13) of Garnett to reject all of the elements in Applicant's claim 1.

The above-reference citation from columns 32-33 of Garnett discloses the logical arrangement of a load balancer within a computer system and the paths of data packets through a computer system using a load balancer. The citation from columns 35-36 discloses how load balancing is performed by a load balancer of Garnett.

The Examiner has equated the "determining at least one data-processing function" limitation to the "load balancing" of Garnett. **The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As illustrated in Figures 19a and 19b, Garnett discloses that load balancing is initially performed on all of the incoming data traffic. See Garnett, col. 32, lines 63-65 and col. 33, lines 2-3. Therefore, load balancing is uniformly performed with regard to all incoming packets and there is no determination of a data-processing function based on the received packet.**

Furthermore, assuming for the sake of argument that the “determining at least one data-processing function” limitation is the same as the “load balancing” of Garnett, then Garnett does not disclose steering of the at least one received packet to one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles the determined data-processing function (which the Examiner has equated to the load balancing), as recited by the Applicant in claim 1. As stated above, Garnett discloses that load balancing is performed by the load balancer with regard to all incoming packets, prior to the data even reaching the server 505 of Garnett. Therefore, steering for purposes of load balancing, after determination of a data-processing function, is not possible in the system of Garnett.

The Applicant also points out that load balancing is performed by the load balancer 501, which is not a blade server, as disclosed by the Applicant.

Therefore, the Applicant maintains that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “determining at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet, based on said at least one received packet,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Garnett and is allowable. Independent claims 11 and 21 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 11 and 21 are also allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

A2. Examiner's Response to Arguments in the Final Office Action

The Applicant points out that page 2 of the Advisory Office Action repeats the Examiner's argument stated in pages 2-5 ("Response to Arguments" section) of the Final Office Action. **The Applicant has already responded to Examiner's "Response to Arguments" section in the August 27, 2007 response. However, the Advisory Office Action does not address any of the Applicant's arguments stated in, for example, pages 11-13 of the August 27, 2007 response.** The Applicant maintains the arguments stated in the August 27, 2007 response, and restates these arguments herein below.

The Examiner states the following in the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action:

Garnett briefly discloses in Figures 19a and 19b that **load balance is performed on all of the incoming "data traffic"**. Also, in column 31, line 49-column 34, line 40, Garnett briefly discloses why one ordinary skilled in the art would be needing a load balancer and the functionality of load balancing.

* * *

It is clear that Garnett (at Col. 31, lines 53-62) is referring to computer systems management in many different ways such functions include load distribution, access control, and secure transaction management and many others with greatest reliability and/or speed. One ordinary skilled in the art would know all such functions are related to data-processing, data management, and data access control as all of them requires reliable , fast, secure data processing or data management by dedicated computer hardware .

* * *

Therefore, one ordinary skilled in the art would know the weighted load on each server is "data" and each data loads are monitored using a software agent running on each server to determine the load experienced by that particular server. Therefore, Garnett does disclose determining at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet , based on said at least one received packet.

See the Final Office Action at pages 2-4 (emphasis added). **The Applicant points out that even though computer system management may provide many different functionalities, Garnett only discloses load balancing. Furthermore, as stated by the Examiner above (in bolded type), Garnett discloses that the load balancing is performed on all of the incoming data. The Applicant maintains that the load balancing is performed universally and independently of the received packet. In other words, the load balancing (equated by the Examiner to the "data-processing function" limitation in Applicant's claim 1) is not "based on said at least one received packet," as recited in Applicant's claim 1.**

The Final Office Action further states the following:

Garnett also discloses: "Each of the servers 505 is connected to the load balancer 501 via a switch 503. Thus incoming data packets arrive at the load balancer and are routed there through to a selected server 505 ." [Column 32 , lines 59-65].

See the Final Office Action at page 4. The Applicant points out that at the above citation used by the Examiner, Garnett clearly discloses that the load balancer 501 is reached by the incoming data prior to the switch 503 and the server 505. This further supports the fact that Garnet initially performs load balancing on all incoming data, and

then the load-balanced data is communicated to the switch 503 and the server 505. This is also clearly illustrated in Figures 19a and 19b of Garnett. In this regard, load balancing is performed by the load balancer 501, prior to even reaching the server 505. Therefore, the Applicant also maintains that Garnett does not disclose steering of the at least one received packet to one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles the determined data-processing function (which the Examiner has equated to the load balancing), as recited by the Applicant in claim 1.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claim 2, 12, and 22

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 12, and 22 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “generating at least one association between a particular packet characteristic of said at least one packet and a particular data-processing function associated with said at least one packet,” as recited by the Applicant in claims 2, 12, and 22.

The Examiner has used the same citation for purposes of rejecting claims 2, 12, and 22. With regard to claim 2, the Final Office Action states the following at page 6:

As per claim 2, Garnett discloses generating at least one association between a particular packet characteristic [data packet] of said packet and a particular data processing function associated with said at least

one packet (see column 31, lines 25-27; column 31, lines 53-57; column 32, lines 59-65, column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44).

The Applicant would like to point out that “[data packet]” is not a particular packet characteristic. In addition, Garnet, including the above listed citations of Garnet stated by the Examiner, does not disclose or suggest that a particular packet characteristic of the packet is associated with a particular data processing function associated with the packet, as recited in Applicant’s claims 2, 12, and 22. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 12, and 22 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2, 12, and 22.

C. Rejection of Dependent Claims 3, 13, and 23

Claims 3, 13, and 23 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims, 3, 13, and 23 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “wherein said particular packet characteristic is one or more of a packet type, a packet field and a flag,” as recited by the Applicant in claims 3, 13, and 23.

The Examiner has used the same citation for purposes of rejecting claims 3, 13, and 23. With regard to claim 3, the Final Office Action states the following at page 6:

As per claim 3, Garnett discloses said particular packet characteristic is at one or more of a packet type [data packet itself is one packet type], a packet field and a flag (see column 31, lines 25-27; column 31, lines 53-57; column 32, lines 59-65column 32,line 55 - column 33, line 44).

The Examiner alleges that “data” packet itself is a type of packet. The Applicant respectfully disagrees since any packet in the relevant field of art is a data packet. While there may be different types of data packets, a “data” packet per se is not a type of packet. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 3, 13, and 23 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 3, 13, and 23.

D. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 14, and 24

Claims, 4, 14, and 24 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 14, and 24 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 14, and 24.

E. Rejection of Dependent Claim 5, 15, and 25

Claims 5, 15, and 25 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 5, 15, and 25 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims, 5, 15, and 25.

F. Rejection of Dependent Claims 6, 16, and 26

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 6, 16, and 26 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 6, 16, and 26.

G. Rejection of Dependent Claims 7, 17, and 27

Claims 7, 17, and 27 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 7, 17, and 27 are allowable over the

reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “assigning a default blade server, selected from said plurality of blade servers, for handling said at least one received packet,” as recited by the Applicant in claims 7, 17, and 27.

The Examiner has used the same citation for purposes of rejecting claims 7, 17, and 27. With regard to claim 7, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

As per claim 7, Garnett discloses assigning a default blade server, selected from said plurality of blade server, for handling said at least one received packet (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13).

The Applicant would like to point out that even though Garnett, at the above citations, discloses that load balancing is initially performed on all of the incoming data traffic, Garnett does not disclose any assigning of a default blade server to handle the received packet, as recited in Applicant's claim 7. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 7, 17, and 27 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 7, 17, and 27.

H. Rejection of Dependent Claim 8, 18, and 28

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 8, 18, and 28 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “steering said at least one packet to said default blade server if at least one of: said at least one received packet is unrecognized; and said at least one received packet contains a particular data,” as recited by the Applicant in claims 8, 18, and 28.

With regard to claim 8, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

As per claim 8, Garnett discloses steering said at least one packet to said default blade server if at least one of: said at least one received packet is unrecognized (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 34, lines 15-40); and said at least one received packet contains a particular data (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13).

The Applicant would like to point out that Garnett, at the above citations, does not disclose that any packet is steered to a default server for processing. In fact, Garnett also does not disclose any packet steering based on whether the packet is recognized or not, or based on the packet content, as recited by the Applicant in claims, 8, 18, and 28. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 8, 18, and 28 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 8, 18, and 28.

I. Rejection of Dependent Claims 9, 19, and 29

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims, 9, 19, and 29 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that Garnett does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “controlling steering of said at least one packet by at least one of said plurality of blade servers,” as recited by the Applicant in claims 9, 19, and 29.

With regard to claim 9, the Final Office Action states the following at page 7:

As per claim 9, Garnett discloses controlling steering of said at least one packet by at least one of said plurality of blade servers (see column 32, line 55 - column 33, line 44 and column 35, line 7 - column 36, line 13).

As already stated above, Garnett does not disclose or suggest any packet steering to a default blade server. In addition, Garnett, at the above citation, also does not disclose or suggest that packet steering is controlled by a blade server, as recited by the Applicant in claims 9, 19, and 29. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 9, 19, and 29 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 9, 19, and 29.

J. Rejection of Dependent Claims 10, 20, and 30

Claims 10, 20, and 30 depend on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 10, 20, and 30 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 10, 20, and 30.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the Examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$510 (to cover the Brief on Appeal Fee) and any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 06-JAN-2009

By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/
Ognyan Beremski, Reg. No. 51,458
Attorney for Applicant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775 – 8100

(OIB)

CLAIMS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

1. A method for processing data in a server, the method comprising:
receiving at least one packet;
determining at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet, based on said at least one received packet; and
steering said at least one received packet to one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function.
2. The method according to claim 1, comprising generating at least one association between a particular packet characteristic of said at least one packet and a particular data-processing function associated with said at least one packet.
3. The method according to claim 2, wherein said particular packet characteristic is one or more of a packet type, a packet field and a flag.
4. The method according to claim 2, comprising assigning at least one of said plurality of blade servers for handling said particular data-processing function.
5. The method according to claim 1, comprising determining which of said plurality of blade servers handles said determined at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet.

6. The method according to claim 1, comprising processing said steered at least one received packet by said one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function.

7. The method according to claim 1, comprising assigning a default blade server, selected from said plurality of blade servers, for handling said at least one received packet.

8. The method according to claim 7, comprising steering said at least one packet to said default blade server if at least one of:

said at least one received packet is unrecognized; and
said at least one received packet contains a particular data.

9. The method according to claim 1, comprising controlling steering of said at least one packet by at least one of said plurality of blade servers.

10. The method according to claim 9, wherein said at least one of said plurality of blade servers controlling said steering is a switch blade.

11. A machine-readable storage having stored thereon, a computer program having at least one code section for processing data in a server, the at least one code

section being executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform steps comprising:

receiving at least one packet;

determining at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet, based on said at least one received packet; and

steering said at least one received packet to one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function.

12. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for generating at least one association between a particular packet characteristic of said at least one packet and a particular data-processing function associated with said at least one packet.

13. The machine-readable storage according to claim 12, wherein said particular packet characteristic is one or more of a packet type, packet field and a flag.

14. The machine-readable storage according to claim 12, comprising code for assigning at least one of said plurality of blade servers for handling said particular data-processing function.

15. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for determining which of said plurality of blade servers handles said determined at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet.

16. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for processing said steered at least one received packet by said one or more of a plurality of blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function.

17. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for assigning a default blade server, selected from said plurality of blade servers, for handling said at least one received packet.

18. The machine-readable storage according to claim 17, comprising code for steering said at least one packet to said default blade server if at least one of:

said at least one received packet is unrecognized; and

said at least one received packet contains a particular data.

19. The machine-readable storage according to claim 11, comprising code for controlling steering of said at least one packet by at least one of said plurality of blade servers.

20. The machine-readable storage according to claim 19, wherein said at least one of said plurality of blade servers controlling said steering is a switch blade.

21. A system for processing data in a server, the system comprising:
at least one blade server that receives at least one packet;
said at least one blade server determines at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet, based on said at least one received packet; and

said at least one blade server steers said at least one received packet to one or more of a plurality of other blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function.

22. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one blade server and at least one of said plurality of other blade servers generates at least one association between a particular packet characteristic of said at least one packet and a particular data-processing function associated with said at least one packet.

23. The system according to claim 22, wherein said particular packet characteristic is one or more of a packet type, a packet field, and a flag.

24. The method according to claim 22, wherein said at least one blade server and said at least one of said plurality of other blade servers assigns at least one of said plurality of blade servers to handle said particular data-processing function.

25. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one blade server determines which of said plurality of other blade servers handles said determined at least one data-processing function associated with said at least one received packet.

26. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at one or more of said plurality of other blade servers that handles said determined data-processing function processes said steered at least one received packet.

27. The system according to claim 21, wherein said at least one blade server and at least one of said plurality of other blade servers, selected from said plurality of blade servers, assigns a default blade server for handling said at least one received packet.

28. The system according to claim 27, wherein said at least one blade server and at least one of said plurality of other blade servers steers said at least one packet to said default blade server, if at least one of:

said at least one received packet is unrecognized; and

said at least one received packet contains a particular data.

29. The system according to claim 21, comprising controlling steering of said at least one packet by said at least one blade server.

30. The system according to claim 29, wherein said at least one blade server that controls said steering is a switch blade.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

- (1) United States Patent No. 7,032,037 (“Garnett”), entered into record by the Examiner in the March 7, 2007 Office Action.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.